

**Nevada Department of Education  
Teachers and Leaders Council  
Wednesday, March 25, 2015 - 9:00 A.M.**

**Meeting Locations**

NV Dept. of Education  
700 E. Fifth Street  
Board Room  
Carson City, NV 89701

and

NV Dept. of Education  
9890 S. Maryland Parkway  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Board Room  
Las Vegas, NV 89183

and

Great Basin College  
1500 College Parkway  
High Tech Center, RM 137  
Elko, NV 89801

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

*The public is hereby noticed that the Nevada Department of Education/Teachers and Leaders Council reserves the right to take agenda items out of posted order (except that public hearings will not begin earlier than posted times). Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time and items may be combined for consideration. A time for public comment is provided at the beginning and at the conclusion of the meeting. A time limit of three minutes will be imposed by the Council Chair for public comments, in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Council. The Council Chair reserves the right to call on individuals from the audience or to allow for testimony at any time. Individuals providing testimony must complete a visitor card.*

*Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting. Please call the Council assistant at (702) 668-4308, at least five business days in advance so that arrangements can be made.*

*This public notice has been posted at the offices of the Department of Education (NDE) in Carson City and Las Vegas, at the 17 Nevada County School District Superintendents' Offices, at the 17 County Public Libraries, and at the Nevada State Library and Archives. Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet through the Nevada Department of Education website at [www.nde.doe.nv.gov](http://www.nde.doe.nv.gov).*

*The support materials to this agenda are available next to the meeting date referenced above, at no charge on the NDE website at: [http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards\\_Commissions\\_Councils/Teachers\\_and\\_Leaders\\_Council/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/Teachers_and_Leaders_Council/). You may also contact Laurie Hamilton at the Department of Education Office at 9890 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89183*

**MINUTES**

**1. Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance**

Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Start delayed in order to achieve quorum. 9:17 a.m. Chair Salazar called the meeting to order. Pledge of Allegiance recited. Roll call completed with attendance as indicated. Nine (9) members were present constituting a quorum. Chair Salazar gave an overview of the agenda items and meeting content.

**Council Members Present**

Pamela Salazar, Chair  
Amy Henderson (left at lunch)  
Jason Sanderson  
Vida Bierria  
Dena Durish  
Gabe Gonzalez

Kim Metcalf (left 10:41)  
Dale Norton  
Jessie Phee  
Terri Janison (arrived 9:42)  
Theo Small (arrived 11:48)

**Absent Council Members**

Barbara Barker  
Theresa Crowley

Veronica Frenkel  
Dottie Smith

**NDE Staff Present**

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Professional  
Leslie James, Education Programs Professional  
Richard Vineyard, Education Programs Supervisor  
Laurie Hamilton, Assistant to Council

**Legal Counsel**

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

### Public Attendance

Heather Synold, CCSD  
Verena Bryan, CCSD/IDPL  
Irma Pumphrey, CCSD, Health Services  
Sha Vickery, CCSD, Health Services  
Yvonne Chaves, CCSD Health Services  
Debra Amnagil, CCSD, Health Services  
Sara Williams, CCSD  
Annie Amoia, CCSD  
Sylvia Tegano, RPDP  
Robert Jones, CCSD, IDDL  
Thomas (Todd) Andrews, CCSD  
Dawn Huckaby, WCSD  
Ben Hayes, WCSD  
Nancy Kuhles, NSHA Coalition  
Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP

Karen Stanley, RPDP  
Peter Reynolds, CCSD Psych Services  
Kathleen Vokits, CCSD, Health Services  
Heather Strassser, CCSD, Health Services  
Andrea Klafter-Rakita, CCSD  
Linda Quinn, UNLV  
Michael Rube CCSD  
Andre Long, CCSD  
Marjorie Conner, RPDP  
Tim McIvor, CCSD, NVASP  
Seth Rau, NV Succeeds  
J.T. Stark, WCSD  
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD  
Kirsten Odegard, Sierra NV College

## **2. Public Comment #1**

*Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair of the Teachers and Leaders Council will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Teachers and Leaders Council jurisdiction, control or advisory power.*

### Carson City

No public comment.

### Las Vegas

Linda Quinn – UNLV, Associate Dean Academic and Professional Programs

Dean Quinn stated that UNLV has been working on the NEPF to adapt their pre-service programs to the lesson planning format they require students to know and do. They are also attempting to adapt Practicum I and II and student teachers to make NEPF standards attainable as they develop as practitioners. They are using what appears to be the NEPF format. They are wondering if this is acceptable or if they are overstepping.

Greg Ott – Deputy Attorney General

Since this item is not on the agenda, the discussion is to be handled between NDE and UNLV off-line.

Michael Rube – Member NV Board of Directors for the Association of School Psychologists

Mr. Rube stated that based on their meetings across the state, school psychologists disagree with the accountability of the evaluation framework as proposed. Their members want the unique, specific, and research-based National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) standards to be their framework in NV. They believe it is too much of a stretch to link the NASP practice model to a set of outcomes that are designed for teachers. They are also deeply concerned with the 50% weighting based on student outcomes. They believe that this weighting will be even less relevant in the rural districts.

Sara Williams – Treasurer, NV Association of School Psychologists

Ms. Williams stated that the NEPF does not reflect their profession, as do the national standards. The national framework has already been created, evaluated, revised extensively, with expert input. She shared that the recent legislative session has brought members of the OLP groups together and that through their conversations they have discussed that TLC has not been given enough time to create these standards. The school psychologists believe that the standards are too important and there is too much disagreement on the NEPF and it must be given the time and consideration it deserves. Ms. Williams stated that there is no way to settle this task during the current legislative term.

Verena Bryan - CCSD, Project Facilitator for Curriculum Engine

Ms. Bryan detailed her work on the NEPF with Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) and project facilitator groups throughout the stakeholder process. They are concerned that the day-to-day work of over 350 TOSAs and project facilitators does not fit into the model of the NEPF.

Sha Vickery – CCSD, School Nurse; Representing School Nurses of NV

Ms. Vickery shared her experiences from having participated in OLEP meetings since October 2014, where school nurses from across the state reviewed the NEPF framework for its effectiveness as an appraisal framework for school nurses in NV. They found that the instructional standards written into the NEPF accurately represent activities of school nurses; and therefore, are appropriate as a performance appraisal document of NV school nurses. However, they believe that the professional responsibilities portion of the NEPF does not accurately represent the national standards and practices as set by the American Nurses Association and the National Association of School Nurses. Ms. Vickery asserted that these standards provide the guidelines that should be employed in evaluating the professional responsibilities for school nurses.

Yvonne Chaves – CCSD, Health Services Coordinator, School Nurse

Ms. Chaves shared her point of view that the engagement of school nurses in the NEPF process has enhanced their understanding of the role of the school nurse. School nurses are often put in life saving situations which requires them to demonstrate competencies to make a difference in a child's life. These can be daily situations. These situations require them to be evaluated with a tool based on their national standards. School nurses are in support of the 5% instructional standards, as well as the 45% professional standards. She stated that it is evident to them that there is more work to be done to develop an evaluation tool in all disciplines of the OLEP.

Pete Reynolds – CCSD, Coordinator Psychological Services

Mr. Reynolds reminded the TLC that in bill draft SB8, an enhancement is necessary to fully define OLEP (other licensed personnel.)

### **3. Approval of Flexible Agenda**

*(For Possible Action)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

**Member Metcalf - Motioned for approval of flexible agenda.**

**Member Phee – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar - Stated that there was a motion on the floor to approve a flexible agenda. She called for discussion and none occurred. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **4. Election of Council Chair Pursuant to NRS 391.455**

*(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)* Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

DAG Ott - Explained nomination and voting procedure to elect TLC chair and asked if there were any questions. Member Durish clarified that annual Chair elections are required per NRS 391.455.

Chair Salazar - Was asked and gave a brief discussion of the Chair responsibilities. DAG Ott added his perspective about work with AG's office.

DAG Ott – Asked for chair nominations.

**Member Metcalf - Nominated Dr. Salazar as Chair for the upcoming year.**

**DAG Ott - Asked for additional nominations. Hearing / seeing none, he brought nominations to a close and moved to a vote. Members present voted unanimously in favor of Dr. Salazar as chair. DAG Ott confirmed the vote.** Dr. Salazar accepted the Chair position for the upcoming year. DAG Ott closed Agenda Item #4.

### **5. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes**

*(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

- a. January 21, 2015
- b. February 18, 2015

Chair Salazar - Explained that the minutes were not able to be finalized for this meeting. Although the January audio meeting was transcribed and reviewed thoroughly, there were gaps in which speakers did not identify themselves. This resulted in not being able to determine who made and seconded motions and who was participating in discussions. Chair Salazar asked that those speaking identify themselves to eliminate gaps in the audio record and resulting minutes.

## **6. Department of Education Updates**

*(Information/Discussion)* Dena Durish Director, NDE Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement

Member Durish – Directed audience to the screen display of the website for the Office of Educator Development and Support / NEPF where Validation Study information and communications have been updated for year two of the validation study.

Three (3) milestones have occurred.

- 1) The WestEd validation team attended a meeting of the NV Association of School Superintendents (NASS).
- 2) WestEd randomly selected 29 principals from the 125 Validation Schools to interview with regard to the validation study implementation. The principals represent rural and urban schools from different geographic regions, school sizes, and populations.
- 3) An on-line survey has been sent to all principals, assistant principals, and deans statewide, whether or not they participated in the Validation Study. Additional emails will be sent to Superintendents for them to encourage their principals to answer the surveys and distribute it to their teachers.

Member Durish – Stated the importance of all of the above responding to the survey, with the understanding that within a few months the NEPF will be at full implementation. She explained the content, complexities, and differences between the different surveys. She fielded questions as to the purpose of this survey.

Members Phee and Janison - Questioned the possible need for additional training during statewide NEPF implementation, and more importantly, the funding for such training.

Member Durish - Provided an overview of the budget recommendations from Governor Sandoval for the modernization of the education system and inclusion of all students throughout the system.

She directed audience to the handout materials that detailed the Governor's proposals and will provide the website location that contains the information. She also showed the new Licensure and Nevada Educator Equity-Plan website links for members' information.

Chair Salazar – Stated that the bulk of Agenda Item #7 had been discussed and voted on during the previous meeting. The remaining discussion and possible action topics are minor adjustments to previous motions. She called for a ten minute break.

BREAK – Recording stops.

## **7. Peer Evaluation Recommendations**

Pursuant to NRS 391.460, the Council will finalize recommendations related to peer evaluations to be made to the State Board of Education. *(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

- a. Selection  
*(No recording for this item. See handouts for details.)*

- b. Training  
*(Recording resumes)*

Chair Salazar - ...on those certification tests. Those were the only changes and adjustments to Peer Evaluator Training based on extensive dialogue.

- c. Support

Chair Salazar – Stated that the concerns for Peer Evaluator Support were about how the performance of the peer evaluators was going to be monitored and what the expectations were. She added that the motion was to approve the Peer Evaluator Support segment. The addition was: failure to meet high level of performance for certification would result in removal from peer evaluator role.

Chair Salazar - Entertained a motion to adopt the peer evaluator recommendations from the TLC in its entirety. A motion has already been passed at a previous meeting for each of the selection, training, and support areas, with the exceptions added at the January meeting. This set of recommendations will be presented at the April SBE meeting.

Member Gonzalez - Asked a clarifying question in reference to certification criteria between a peer evaluator and licensed administrator. Chair Salazar provided extensive clarification on the differences between the two and a historical review of the discussions on this issue over time.

**Chair Salazar - Stated the floor is open for a motion with regard to moving forward with the peer evaluator recommendations.**

**Member Janison – Made a motion to accept the peer evaluator recommendations with the change from the last meeting as presented today.**

**Member Gonzalez – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar - Asked for further comment. Hearing none, she called for the vote. Motion carried unanimously.** Chair Salazar summarized that TLC will move forward with these recommendations to the State Board of Education, who may then move forward with developing guidelines and recommendations for the districts to develop their systems.

## **8. Recommendations for Other Licensed Educational Personnel/Group 3 Framework**

*(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Professional; Leslie James, NDE Education Programs Professional

- a. Update on Stakeholder and Stakeholder Advisory Team Meetings
- b. NEPF Group 3 “Business Rules”
- c. Alignment with NEPF Groups 1 and 2 Teacher Standards and Indicators, Instructional and Professional Responsibilities

Chair Salazar - Reminded the group of the statutory requirements the TLC was tasked with in regard to Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP), and that they must leave this meeting with recommendations in regard to evaluation of the OLEP. These recommendations will be taken to the State Board of Education during their April meeting. Chair Salazar gave the floor to Kathleen Galland-Collins.

Kathleen Galland-Collins - Directed the group to the PowerPoint presentation handout and provided descriptions as to the content and use of the information. She delivered an extensive overview of the TLC work and legislative history in regard to Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) in reference to the NEPF and the professional responsibilities recommendations.

Member questions and extensive discussion followed.

The next portion of Ms. Galland-Collins’ presentation focused on suggested weightings by OLEP stakeholders for Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles. She directed the members to the next portion of her handout for the stakeholder recommendations. She pointed out the difficulty of coming to consensus among the group(s) due to the disparity of the type of professionals, their assignments, level of student interactions and impact on student learning, and their national practice standards.

Members engaged in questions and discussion.

**LUNCH – 30 Minutes to Resume at 1:10 pm**

Chair Salazar – Called for resumption of the meeting continuing with Agenda Item #8. She asked members to view the one page sheet “Recommendations to TLC,” as it outlined the motions that TLC will need to consider in preparation for making recommendations to the State Board of Education as to the framework. Items for consideration are: 1) Criteria for who is included in Group 3; 2) Do we want to split Group 3 into two, based on roles and responsibilities; 3) Are there items that need to be added to clarify the rubric, particularly in regard to descriptor notes and evidence; 4) Decisions regarding weighting.

**Chair Salazar - Entertained a motion to define the criteria to be included as Group 3 teachers.**

Member questions and discussions followed.

**Member Janison – Motioned for Group 3 criteria to be licensed by NDE and an educator who serves as instructional support that spends not more than 50% of their work year providing instruction to learners; or education personnel that spend at least 50% of their work year providing student-level and/or systems-level services that support learners to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards.**

**Member Small – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar – Asked for any additional discussion regarding the criteria for an educator to be included as a Group 3 teacher. She called for the vote. Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Salazar - Proceeded to describe the second motion she wanted to entertain. That motion was the recommendation from the task force as to the grouping within Group 3. Group 3 will be divided into two distinct roles. Subgroup “1” is being defined by function as Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles. This group is defined, from the previous motion passed, as the educators who spend not more than 50% of the work year providing instruction to learners. Subgroup “2” are Specialized Educational Professionals who spend at least 50% of their work year providing student-level and/or systems-level services that support learners to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards.

**Chair Salazar asked for a motion to create subgroups within Group 3 that are defined by the two functions stated and align with the definitions that were just passed.** Additional member questions, requests for clarification and discussions occurred. Chair clarified that only definitions are being considered at this time. The first definition was to define OLEP. A second motion was being considered to delineate within the definition of Group 3 two groups based on what they do: instructional and non-instructional based personnel. She entertained a motion with regard to that definition.

**Member Small – Moved that within Group 3 the subgroups be separated in to Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles and the second group as Specialized Education Professionals.**

**Chair Salazar – Asked Member Small to define the two groups for the record.**

**Member Small – Stated for the record that Subgroup 1, Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles, would be defined as librarians and other licensed educational personnel who spent not more than 50% of their work year providing instruction to learners. Subgroup2, Specialized Educational Professionals such as counselors, would be defined as those who spend at least 50% of the work year providing student-level and/or systems-level services that support learners to access and/or process the curriculum to meet the academic standards.**

Chair Salazar – Stated that there is a motion on the floor that now defines two groups within Group 3 criteria as Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles as described by function, as well as Specialized Educational Personnel as defined by function.

**Member Phee – Seconded the motion.**



**Chair Salazar – Acknowledged the motion being seconded and opened the floor for any additional clarification, questions, or discussion from members. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion carried unanimously.**

Chair stated that the next items for consideration were the rubric, standards, and indicators. The key changes were “teacher” was to be identified as “educator” and “student” to be referred to as “learner,” to broaden the context of how they serve in these positions. The other piece was that there was to be an expectation and clarity around the rubrics, standards, and indicators through descriptor notes and evidence grounded, aligned, and supported within national standards and research. The final piece was implementation and did not seem to be in the purview of the TLC. She then reviewed several more modification requests for language and rubric changes from the specialized educational non-instructional personnel subgroup. She left it up to the TLC members as to how the motion is to be framed.

Member questions and discussion followed.

**Member Gonzalez – Presented a motion to approve the Instructional Standards for Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles and Professional Responsibility Standards.**

**Chair Salazar – Stated there was a motion on the floor that approves the Standards and Indicators for both Instructional and Professional Practice Standards for the Subgroup 1: Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles (with previously presented modifications and national standards indicators.) She called for a second to the motion.**

**Member Janison – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar – Restated the issues being voted on. She asked for discussion. Hearing none, she moved forward with the vote. Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair moved to the Subgroup 2: Specialized Educational Professionals, non-instruction based and detailed previously proposed modifications. She entertained a motion for approval of this set of standards.

**Member Janison – Motioned to approve the Instructional Practice Standards for the Specialized Educational Professionals to modify the indicators to begin with verbs; eliminating the need for educator language and broadening the reach to all professionals in context to expand and define evidence and descriptors grounded in research, national standards and ethical codes (when applicable) that provide for the nuance for each indicator. This would not modify the indicator language. It adds an addendum to the rubric in regard to the level of implementation, and understands and/or utilizes the standards listed above to enable self, students, teaching staff, colleagues, and our parents. Finally, change the name of Instructional Standards to Professional Practice Standards. In addition, replace Professional Responsibility Standard #5 – Student Perception with the new Professional Performance Standard #5 to include the indicators: Engages in evidence and/or database decision making to manage and provide services and support; Demonstrates current professional knowledge and competency to provide direct and/or indirect professional services to support the learner; and Manages program caseload and/or workload related to specific roles and responsibilities.**

**Chair Salazar – Stated that there was a motion on the floor with regard to Specialized Educational Professionals and their standards and asked if there was a second.**

**Member Gonzalez – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar – Asked for any discussion surrounding the motion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair stated that the discussion will now move on to “Weighting.” She stated that she first wanted to open discussion about Subgroup 1: Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles. She offered members the option to begin with a motion or discussion.

**Member Janison – Placed a motion for discussion to accept the weighting for Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles for Instructional Practice at 25% and for Professional Responsibilities at 25%.**

Chair Salazar – Asked for a second to Member Janison’s motion.

**Member Bierria – Seconded the motion.**

Chair Salazar – Stated that the motion on the floor was only considering Educational Practices. The weighting within the teachers’ and administrators’ systems is 35% based on instruction and 15% based on professional responsibilities. She clarified that the motion before the members is now for 25% Instructional Practice and 25% Professional Responsibilities. Chair asked for discussion. No discussion being heard, Chair asked Kat to provide clarification as to how the task force arrived at 25% / 25% weighting.

Galland –Collins – Clarified that the OLEP stakeholders wanted to emphasize the instruction as well as the role they play at the building level, as each role is equally important. Therefore, they wanted them weighted evenly to recognize both roles.

**Chair Salazar - Asked for additional comments, questions, or discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote as to the weightings of Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities, each being 25% under Educational Practice for Teaching Professionals with Unique Roles as a Group 3 Other Licensed Educational Personnel. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Chair Salazar - Directed the discussion to Specialized Educational Professionals. She reiterated that Educational Practice is defined as Professional Practice plus Professional Responsibilities. Two different weightings have been brought before the group. The Council may make a recommendation for either set of those weightings, or a Council member may make a recommendation of different weightings. She entertained a motion as to the suggested weightings for Specialized Educational Professionals on Educational Practice.**

**Member Small – Motioned that weighting for Educational Practice under Specialized Educational Professionals, Professional Practice be set at 15% and Professional Responsibilities at 35%.**

Chair Salazar – Restated Member Small’s motion and asked for a second to the motion.

Member Janison – Seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar – Opened the floor for discussion.

Member discussion centered about the flexibility being allowed in the Descriptor Notes and Evidence, not the Standards and Indicators; that it has been TLC’s intention all along that the Standards and Indicators will not change between groups; clarification was also noted in reference to the two subgroups of Group 3 and that they are not defined by title, but rather by Other Licensed Educational Personnel who spend not more than 50% of their work year providing instruction to learners; those that spend at least 50% of the work year providing student-level and/or systems-level services; weightings will then apply to educator / professional groups as established; weighting for the second subgroup remaining as motioned at 35% and 15%; members of these subgroups are defined at discretion of the districts; TLC will have nothing to do with it after that and other weighting options are no longer being considered; once consensus is reached by the TLC, weightings can be implemented and then re-evaluated based on practice after a 5 year period.

**Chair Salazar – Restated the motion on the floor that reduces the Educational Practice to one framework for this second group, Specialized Personnel that are non-instruction based, with 15% /35% split. She asked for any other comment or discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair continued and moved to the topic of the Student Outcomes side of the weightings. The task force has had very little discussion as to weightings when it comes to Student Outcomes, as it was already in law. Just as Groups 1 and 2 are under the 50% weighting, so is Group 3. TLC does have to come up with



recommendations to Student Performance and 50%. For the Group 3 teachers, TLC has to use School-wide Aggregate Scores, as there is nothing else available in current law.

Kathleen Galland-Collins – Reviewed input from the Great Teacher and Leaders Guidebook for benchmark research as to what others are using to evaluate student outcomes and associated data and results effecting educator evaluations. The remainder of the report is contained in the presentation material attachments.

Member discussion focused on options for assessing Student Outcome weighting within Group 1, 2, and 3; maintaining consistency among the groups or not; and methodology and data collection sources from around the country as to their relevance to Nevada.

**Member Gonzalez – Motioned to maintain Student Performance and Student Outcomes to match Groups 1 and 2.**

Chair Salazar – Restated motion on the floor for Student Performance weighting at 50%; comprised of Student Growth at 35%, Reducing Gaps at 10%, Student Proficiency at 5%, based on school aggregate data.

**Member Norton – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar – Opened floor for discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion was carried unanimously.**

## **9. TLC Recommendations for 2015 Legislature**

*(Information/Discussion/For Possible Actions)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

- a. Inclusion of principal supervisors in NEPF, based on recommendations from TLC to the State Board
- b. Provision of fiscal support for development and use of a statewide technology platform for NEPF
- c. Allowance of a one-year extension for “other licensed educational personnel” while TLC continues development of standards/indicators
- d. Three “observation” cycles vs. three “evaluation” cycles for probationary teachers and those rated minimally effective or ineffective
- e. Student outcomes reduced from 50% to 40%
- f. Different definition for student outcomes (equal measures from state assessments and from a menu of approved district assessments)

Chair Salazar – Reminded members that the recommendations being brought forward tomorrow to the State Board of Education could result in the Board either taking no stance, taking a stance to support any or all of the TLC recommendations, or supporting none of the recommendations. She reviewed the five recommendations on which TLC agreed during the meeting in February 2015. She asked for any additional recommendations for consideration, questions, or comments.

Member discussion was raised in reference to rationale for technological support to track how many educators are rated as ineffective, minimally effective, effective, or highly effective. This led to a wide-ranging and lengthy discussion as to implementation, scope, the positive and potentially negative effects of utilizing collected data, etc.

Chair Salazar – Stated that she added one additional piece of rationale that says: “improve the efficiency of the system implementation,” and having aggregate data that allows for improvement of the system. No other changes to previous recommendations were made. She asked for additional motions to the suggested recommendations. Chair clarified that this does not have to be an action item unless there is a motion to add an additional recommendation. She recommended that the members track AB447 NV NEPF bill. This brought up questions about whether or not adequate funding for RPDP<sup>2</sup>s to implement NEPF had been brought up as a recommendation.

**Member Norton – Asked if the Chair was entertaining a motion to add adequate funding as a recommendation. He stated that if so, he would move that TLC add adequate funding to move the professional development process forward.**

Chair Salazar – Restated the possible language for the motion as being something similar to SB407, which was “adequate for the NEPF over the next two years through professional development and other resources.”

Member discussion as to the definition of “adequate” funding was held.

**Chair Salazar – Clarified that she would review SB407 to use some of the same language from that bill for the recommendation. She stated that a motion is necessary to add this to the previous recommendations. She asked for a second to the motion made by Member Norton.**

**Member Gonzalez – Seconded the motion.**

**Chair Salazar – Restated the motion on the floor for funding requests specifically for the support of the implementation of the NEPF over the next two years. She asked for discussion. Hearing none she called for the vote. Member Durish abstained for the record. Motion carried with one abstention.**

Chair stated that the additional recommendation will be added to the TLC items being presented at the SBE meeting tomorrow. She asked for any additional discussion in regard to Agenda Item #9.

Member discussion included the idea from previous meetings as to whether or not TLC wants to make recommendations as to who will be part of Group 3; does TLC want the Legislature to clarify who Group 3 members are; and does TLC want to take a stance as to non-instructional staff should not be part of Group 3. Members expressed hesitance to go down that road again, given the amount of work that had already been done. It was the intent of TLC from the discussion at the last meeting that the recommendation for OLEP was more clarification than as described in SB407. The discussion ended with the idea that if an adjustment needs to be made in regard to who are OLEPs, it needs to be corrected in the language.

Chair Salazar – Turned to DAG Ott for direction. She stated that these notes are not exactly what we were trying to say; so how do we make the adjustments we need to make and make them clear?

DAG Ott - Stated that the items have been properly agendized, so they can have the discussion and make a motion to amend them now.

Chair Salazar – Said that TLC wanted to make sure the motion represented what they were saying, but is not delineated in the language. She asked if anyone wanted to make a motion to amend Recommendation #3 to reflect TLC’s actual intention.

Member Janison – Asked a question of DAG Ott, if the motion needed to be made by the member who made the first or seconded the original motion, or can anyone do it?

DAG Ott – Answered that the way the item is agendized now, it is a recommendation so any member can make the motion to alter the recommendation. It doesn’t have to be the person who did it last time.

**Member Janison – Made a motion to amend the motion for the recommendations for legislative consideration to add that TLC would like the Legislature to give their definition as to who is an OLEP.**

Chair Salazar – Restated the motion as: Allow for a one year extension in which the Legislature provides direction on the definition of Other Licensed Educational Personnel. She added that TLC is asking the Legislators to provide the definition. It is not going to be TLC, as they have had this discussion for two years and she did not envision it changing much without guidance from the Legislature.

**Member Gonzalez – Seconded the motion.**

Chair Salazar – Asked for additional discussion.

Member Durish - Asked for re-reading of the motion. She wanted to clarify the language and intent of the recommendations to the Legislature. She expressed concern over asking the Legislature to define OLEPs

when they do not have the expertise to make these decisions. During the legislative session, they have looked to the field for these recommendations. She put it on the record for the members of the public who are representing the OLEP groups and encouraged them to contact Legislators and tell them who these groups are, because the Legislators do not know the information to define these categories. TLC has worked for two years on these issues and still experiences difficulty even with all of the input received.

Chair Salazar – Offered that TLC may withdraw the recommendation to the Legislature to determine who belongs in OLEP groups, as per Member Durish’s observations. She stated that it was up to the members to decide how to proceed.

Member Janison – Asked Kat where OLEP member groups left their discussion, so that TLC can make recommendations.

Kathleen Galland-Collins – Reviewed input from OLEP member groups. She mentioned the required flexibility in the NEPF. She detailed each group and the reasoning behind their separation between the two subgroups.

Member discussion covered a wide range of topics, including history of OLEP groups formation and identification within Group 3; the complexities of the subgroups and how educators are identified as part of each group; groups that do not want to be part of the NEPF; groups wanting to use national standards as their evaluation method and using those standards as weighting; possible recommendations that TLC could make in a variety of scenarios affecting OLEPs and groupings; possibly postponing action for particular groups (Group B, in particular); concerns were raised about the idea of being back where TLC started at the beginning of this process; and that recommendations had already been made and TLC should proceed from that point.

Chair Salazar – Raised the concern that TLC is spending so much time working on evaluation systems for people that may never have been intended to be included in OLEP. She added that TLC’s recommendation would then be that another year would be added to implementation to get clarity around who should be Other Licensed Educational Personnel. The Chair stated that there is a motion on the floor with a second, saying that we did want to amend this motion with clarification. She asked DAG Ott if she can go back to the member who authored the original motion for an amendment, so that she can now include what was just discussed.

DAG OTT – Replied: Since you are looking for an amendment to the original motion, anyone can offer that and it could go back to the person that first offered the motion.

Chair Salazar – Asked DAG Ott: can she restate her motion with more clarity, if the person that seconded the motion agrees?

DAG OTT – Responded: You can do this several ways. She can withdraw the original motion and then restate it, or you can do an amendment with a second.

Chair Salazar – Asked Member Janison to withdraw her original motion and restate it.

**Member Janison – Withdrew her original motion to amend the first recommendation for legislative consideration. She then motioned to amend the recommendation for legislative consideration under Other Licensed Educational Personnel, to allow for a one year extension to continue to define OLEP and what that evaluation system would be under the NEPF. TLC asked for consideration from legislators to assist in further defining what groups are considered under OLEP.**

Chair Salazar – Stated that TLC was requesting the one year extension and also requests that legislators further define who makes up Other Licensed Educational Personnel. TLC will also provide the legislators with a list of whom some of those people are.

**Member Gonzalez – Seconded the new motion.**

Chair Salazar – Asked for the staff member that captured the motion to repeat it. After staff restated the motion Chair Salazar offered that Member Janison’s first part of the statement remains the same: Allow for one year extension in which to continue to define Other Licensed Educational Personnel under the NEPF. She continued: And here is where she made an addition, which said that legislators would further define which members constitute OLEP. Chair stated: And then we could add that TLC could provide a list.

**Member Norton – Called for the question.**

**Chair Salazar – Asked if everyone had this clear in regard to the addition. She called for the vote.**

**Member Durish abstained from the vote. She stated for the record that her abstention vote was due to budget recommendations and she represents a Cabinet Department. It was not related to the discussion of OLEP, but rather to a budget issue. Motion carried with one abstention.**

Chair proceeded to Agenda Item #10.

**10. Update on National Issues and Legal Landscape of Educator Evaluation**

*(Information/Discussion)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Discussed challenges with state assessments, lawsuits filed on behalf of teachers in regard to evaluation systems and student outcomes, and research using growth model systems in evaluating individuals.

**11. Update on Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by the Teacher and Leaders Council of Nevada and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544**

*(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Dr. Sarah Negrete, Northeastern RPDP Director; Kirsten Gleissner, Northwestern RPDP Director; Bill Hanlon, Southern RPDP Director

Sarah Negrete – Provided update for the NNRPDP in Elko. She stated that they completed Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) Training for validation school administrators. Margaret Heritage skyped a 90 minute keynote to both of their groups related to Standard #3. Four of her districts have completed NEPF Overview Training. A post reflection evaluation was given to teachers using “I used to think…” and “Now I think…” statements.

Kirsten Gleissner – Provided an update for the NWRDPD. In Douglas County they have completed training with all teachers and the IRR Training III for all administrators. In Carson City all administrators have completed all nine hours of IRR Training and all validation school teachers have completed twelve hours of rubric trainings. The remaining teachers are scheduled for twelve hours of NEPF training in the fall. In Storey and Churchill Counties all teachers and administrators have been trained. In Lyon County all teachers have received nine hours on the NEPF rubric and the Administrator Training is complete, although they are not submitting as validation schools. Washoe County administrators have received training on the Leadership Instructional Standards. RPDP will return in June to train Washoe administrators on Professional Responsibilities. There is a contingency plan to bring the teacher rubric information to Washoe when appropriate. They have also received feedback statements.

Karen Stanley – Provided the SNRPDP update on behalf of Bill Hanlon. Approximately 90% of administrators have participated in one or more sessions. When trainings are completed on April 7, 2015, they will have 82% of all administrators trained for all three IRR sessions. Make up sessions are planned for those who have not completed requirements. About a third of administrators in Clark County have received Instructional and Leadership Standards training. All administrators in Lincoln and Nye Counties have received the training. An administrator trainer is scheduled to go to Mineral County. The chiefs and other supervisors of principals in Clark County have also received IRR training.

Members asked questions of RPDP representatives.

Chair Salazar - Moved discussion to Agenda Item #12.

**12. Future Agenda Items**

*(Information/Discussion)* Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Reminded members that the next TLC meeting was scheduled for May 20, 2015. That meeting is after two State Board of Education meetings scheduled for March 26 and April 30, 2015. She will present the TLC recommendations defined today at March 26<sup>th</sup> SBE meeting. At SBE meeting on April 30<sup>th</sup> the recommendations with regards to Peer Evaluators and the OLEP NEPF will be presented. During TLC May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, TLC will be hearing the first level of results from the Validation Study, discussing the NEPF implementation plan for next year, and legislative changes that may influence implementation. She moved to Agenda Item #13.

### **13. Public Comment #2**

*Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Teachers and Leaders Council jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Teachers and Leaders Council Chair will impose a time limit of three minutes.*

No public comment in North or Elko meeting locations.

#### Las Vegas

Robert Jones – Library Services Coordinator, Clark County School District

Mr. Jones commented on the first motion of the Group 3 criteria where it was decided that “teacher” be changed to “educators.” Mr. Jones cautioned that the “teacher” term is important and that many teachers view it as an important distinction and designation indicating licensed teachers. He also offered that in the second motion in Group 3, where it says “librarians,” he wanted to make sure that it says “librarians and other licensed educational personnel who spend not more than 50% of their work year.” He stated that this is a good way of defining it, but make it clear in the way that it is presented.

Chair Salazar – Asked for any additional public comment, member closing comments. None offered.

### **14. Adjournment**

Chair Salazar – Adjourned meeting at 3:56 pm.